

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

LITTIECE JONES,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:24-cv-11224

v.

Honorable Susan K. DeClercq
United States District Judge

DELTA AIR LINES, INC.,

Defendant.

**ORDER DENYING AS MOOT DEFENDANT’S MOTION
FOR MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT (ECF No. 21)**

On May 8, 2024, Plaintiff LITTLECE JONES, proceeding *pro se*, sued her employer, Defendant Delta Air Lines, Inc., utilizing a court form entitled “MIED ProSe7 (Rev 5/16) Complaint for Employment Discrimination.” ECF No. 1 at PageID.1. Plaintiff alleged, by checking boxes on the form, that Defendant violated several federal laws when it failed to promote her, failed to accommodate her disability, provided unequal terms and conditions of employment, retaliated against her, and failed to accommodate her religion. *Id.* at PageID.5. To add further detail to her claim, Plaintiff attached to the form 13 pages of written narrative. *See id.* at PageID.10–23.

Noting the difficulty in responding to Plaintiff’s Complaint due to its length and its failure to set forth the allegations in numbered paragraphs, Defendant filed

an answer, but also filed a motion for more definite statement on August 30, 2024. ECF No. 21. During a scheduling conference on October 3, 2024, the Parties agreed that Plaintiff would amend her complaint to provide a more definite statement on or before October 21, 2024.¹ See ECF No. 25.

On October 21, 2024, Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint² which set forth her allegations in numbered paragraphs. ECF No. 26. Defendant filed an Answer to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint on November 4, 2024. ECF No. 27.

Thus, because Plaintiff has filed her Amended Complaint, ECF No. 26, and Defendant has already answered it, ECF No. 27, Defendant's Motion for a More Definite Statement regarding Plaintiff's original complaint, ECF No. 21, is **DENIED AS MOOT.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Susan K. DeClercq
SUSAN K. DeCLERCQ
United States District Judge

Dated: 12/11/2024

¹ Although this date is beyond the timeframe for filing an amended complaint as a matter of course, this Court determined that "justice so require[d]" leave for Plaintiff to amend her complaint to provide a more definite statement, and all parties consented to the October 21 deadline. FED. R. CIV. P. 15(2).

² This document was docketed as a "Reply to Response," but is clearly titled "Amended Complaint with Jury Trial Demand," and so will be considered as such. ECF No. 26.